

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

Case No: 05-80025

Honorable Victoria A. Roberts

v.

KEVIN WATSON,

Defendant.

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION
[ECF No. 975]

Defendant Kevin Watson filed an emergency motion for compassionate release. [ECF No. 967]. The Court entered an order denying Watson's motion. [ECF No. 974]. He now moves for reconsideration of the Order. [ECF No. 975].

Local Rule 7.1(h)(3) provides the Court's standard of review for a motion for reconsideration:

Generally, and without restricting the court's discretion, the court will not grant motions for ... reconsideration that merely present the same issues ruled upon by the court, either expressly or by reasonable implication. The movant must not only demonstrate a palpable defect by which the court and the parties and other persons entitled to be heard on the motion have been misled but also show that correcting the defect will result in a different disposition of the case.

E.D. Mich. LR 7.1(h)(3). Palpable defects are those which are “obvious, clear, unmistakable, manifest or plain.” *Mich. Dep’t of Treasury v. Michalec*, 181 F. Supp. 2d 731, 734 (E.D. Mich. 2002). “It is an exception to the norm for the Court to grant a motion for reconsideration.” *Maiberger v. City of Livonia*, 724 F. Supp. 2d 759, 780 (E.D. Mich. 2010). “[A]bsent a significant error that changes the outcome of a ruling on a motion, the Court will not provide a party with an opportunity to relitigate issues already decided.” *Id.*

Watson fails to raise new issues or demonstrate a palpable defect, the correction of which will result in a different disposition of his motion for compassionate release.

Watson’s motion for reconsideration is **DENIED**.

ORDERED.

s/ Victoria A. Roberts
Victoria A. Roberts
United States District Judge

Dated: May 6, 2021